



MEASUREMENT OF ELECTROLYTIC VOLTAGES GENERATED
BETWEEN COILS AND LAMINATIONS OF FAILED MAIN-RING MAGNETS

B. A. Prichard and B. D. McDaniel

April 12, 1974

Main-Ring magnets fail for a variety of reasons, one of which involves the presence of water. The source of water can be either internal from a leaky coil or external such as from a broken insulator. It was proposed that if a magnet failed because of the presence of water, one should be able to detect an electrolytically generated voltage between the copper coils and the iron laminations. This voltage would be expected to be a few tenths of a volt.

The following measurements were made on several failed magnets. The resistance between coil and lamination was measured for each coil. The self-generated voltage between coil and lamination was also measured for each coil. The manifolds had been removed from all measured magnets, allowing the measurement of all three coils (the upper outer, the lower outer and the inner) separately. All measurements were made with a fluke digital multimeter model 8000A. This instrument has an input impedance of 10 Meg Ω and can measure resistances up to 20 Meg Ω 's. Any resistance which was measured to be greater than 20 Megohms was considered to be infinite.

These measurements were confined to 27 bending magnets constituting the total sum of failed bend magnets stored in the magnet facility. They are stored there for one of two reasons. Either they are radioactive or they have failed very recently.

April 12, 1974

- 2 -

TM-487
0423

After a magnet has failed in the ring it is given a static pressure test in an attempt to determine the possible existence of a leaky coil. This test is recorded on a returned magnet history form. The present measurements have been compiled into the attached table which includes information from the static pressure tests. The table identifies each magnet by number and removal number.

As can be seen from the table it appears that a large fraction of the magnets indicate water related failures. Of the 27 magnets, 6 clearly indicated leaks during the static pressure tests. A seventh gave conflicting results during the test. Four of these seven leakers also produced an electrolytic voltage. The remaining three which did not produce a voltage can be explained as follows: One was a turn-to-turn short which measured ∞ resistance between all coils and laminations. It, therefore, appears that the water did not provide a path between iron and copper but only between coils. In the other two cases the short for one of the set of coils was 0 ohms, therefore, any possible voltaic cell would be shorted out on these voltage coils. The adjacent coils of the set show infinite resistance and no voltage, indicating that they had not been made wet by the same leak.

There were also six instances where a magnet showed no leak under static pressure but did produce an electrolytic voltage. In one such case the magnet was sprayed when an insulator broke. It is presumed that in the other cases the water leak was so small that it was not detected by the static pressure test. From these combined measurements it is concluded that 13 of the 27 magnets indicate water problems. We conclude that magnets that indicate an electrolytic voltage and/or a static pressure loss should be considered to be wet magnets.

Resistance measurements typically produced the following results: ∞ (>20 Meg Ω), a few megohms or 0.0 resistance. Voltage measurements also fell into three categories: 0.0 volts for a dead short, a few millivolts for ∞ resistance (typically 1-3 millivolts) or a few tenths of a volt (.1 to .6). All magnet coils which showed a significant electrolytic voltage also indicated a

April 12, 1974

- 3 -

TM-487
0423

resistance to the laminations of a few megohms. With the exception of one case, the converse is also true. Two new magnets were tested and each coil measured ∞ resistance and a few millivolts. The voltage produced by a wet magnet seemed to depend on the resistance and this is assumed due to the high internal impedance of the cell.

The table of results can be analyzed as follows: Of the 27 magnets 13 or 48% failed due to water problems and 52% were dry or insulation puncture failures. Twenty-three or 85% of the magnets contained inner coils which show less than 20 megohms to ground, 8 (30%) of the magnets had lower coils of low insulation resistance and 4 (15%) had upper coils of low insulation resistance. One magnet (4%) had a turn-to-turn short.

Considering the wet magnets alone 92% (12) had shorted inner coils, 38% (5) had shorted lower coils, 30% (4) had shorted upper coils and 7% (1) had a turn-to-turn short. Of the dry magnets 80% (11) had shorted inners, 20% had shorted lowers. There were no turn-to-turn or upper shorts among the dry magnets. There were also no magnets with more than one coil shorted among the dry magnets.

If one considers the lowest resistance to be the primary short, the following distributions are found: For all magnets 70% (19) had primary shorted inner coils, 18% (5) had primary shorted lower coils, 8% (2) had primary shorted upper coils and 4% (1) had a turn-to-turn short. For the dry magnets the distribution of primary shorts is the same as for total shorts because the dry magnets only contained one shorted coil. For the wet magnets 61% (8) had primary shorted inners, 15% (2) had primary shorted lowers, 15% (2) had primary shorted uppers and 8% (1) had a turn-to-turn short.

April 12, 1974

- 4 -

TM-487
0423

	MAGNET NUMBER	RESISTANCE $M\Omega$			VOLTAGE			PRESSURE TEST	REMOVAL NUMBER	H ₂ O
		U	I	L	U	I	L			
Plaster Stick	1087	∞	0	∞	.003	0.00	.003	Leak	430	W
	1572	∞	2.1	1.8	.001	.190	.125	Sprayed No Leak	498	W
	1578	∞	∞	0	.004	.005	0.00	No Leak		
	2019	∞	0.00	∞	.002	0.00	.001	Leak	484	W
	2026	∞	∞	0.00	.003	.003	0.00	No Leak	505	
	1122	∞	5.34	1.23	.044	.123	.123	No Leak	531	W
	1626	∞	∞	∞	.004	.004	.001	Leak	Turn to Turn 449	W
Epoxy Stick	1659	1.8	.6	3.2	.050	.055	.298	No Leak	527	W
	1667	4.7	0	6.6	.023	0.00	.125	Leak	534	W
	1697	∞	∞	.8	.004	.002	0.00	No Leak	513	
	1699	∞	0	∞	.005	0.00	.001	No Leak	499	
	2649	0.00	.28	∞	0.00	.057	.005	Leak		W
	2707	∞	0.00	∞	.004	0.00	.001	No Leak		
	2709	∞	0.00	∞	.002	0.00	.001	No Leak	515	
Vac Imp.	1226	∞	0.00	∞	.001	0.00	.001	No Leak	509	
	1730	∞	*	∞	.002	.004	.001	No Leak	*Hi Voltage Inner Short 456	
	1743	∞	3.7	∞	.025	.347	.003	Leak	537	W
Integrally Imp.	1244	∞	8.4	∞	.005	.672	.001	No Leak	483	W
	1756	∞	0.00	4.7	.003	0.00	.248	No Leak	494	W
	1762	∞	0.00	∞	.004	0.00	.003	No Leak	489	
	1767	∞	0.00	∞	.004	0.00	.001	No Leak	526	
	1781	∞	0.00	∞	.001	0.00	.008	No Leak	533	
	2252	∞	.05	∞	.003	.004	.002	No Leak	536	
	2273	∞	.2	∞	.002	.017	.005	No Test	504	W
	2779	∞	0.00	∞	.002	0.00	.002	No Leak	497	
	2801	∞	0.00	∞	.002	0.00	.003	No Leak	535	
Super Int. Imp.	2312	0.00	2.8	3.8	0.00	.145	.324	No Leak Leak?		W